



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/675,323	09/28/2000	Henry A. Lardy	HOLISED.063A	2363	
26551 7:	590 11/18/2005		EXAM	INER	
HOLLIS-EDEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.			PESELE	PESELEV, ELLI	
4435 EASTGA	TE MALL				
SUITE 400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN DIEGO,	CA 92121	1623			

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/675,323	LARDY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Elli Peselev	1623				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	/ IS SET TO EXDIRE 2 MONTH	I(S) OP THIRTY (30) DAVS				
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to the apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Oc	ctober 2005.					
<u> </u>	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	· _					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>33-39, 56-59, 61, 63-65 and 67-69</u> is/s	are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) 33-39 is/are withdraw		•				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>56-59, 61, 63-65 and 67-69</u> is/are reje	ected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Fyaminer				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction		• •				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	·					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		tion No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori						
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receiv	ed.				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/675,323

Art Unit: 1623

Claims 33-39 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on December8, 2003.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 56-59, 61, 63-65 and 67-69 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 15 of copending Application No. 10/319,356. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the method of the copending application is encompassed by the method claims of the present application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1623

Claims 56-59, 61, 63-65 and 67-69 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 45 and 48 of copending Application No. 10/814,503. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the methods of the copending application are encompassed by the methods of the present application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Wilson can be reached on (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Elli Peselev

ELLI PESELEV PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1200 Page 3